



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/614,737

07/07/2003

John A. Hicks III

60027.0181USU1/BS02499

6215

39262

7590

03/31/2008

MERCHANT & GOULD BELL SOUTH CORPORATION

P.O. BOX 2903

MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402

EXAMINER

KASRAIAN, ALLAHYAR

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2617

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/31/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/614,737	Applicant(s) HICKS ET AL.	
	Examiner ALLAHYAR KASRAIAN	Art Unit 2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 December 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Continuation of Attachment(s) 3). Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08), Paper No(s)/Mail Date :10/25/2007; 11/14/2007; 01/18/2008; 03/14/2008.

DETAILED ACTION

Art Unit - Location

1. The Art Unit location of this application in the USPTO has changed. To aid in correlating any papers for this application, all further correspondence regarding this application should be directed to Art Unit 2617.

Remarks

2. The present Office Action is in response to Applicant's amendment filed on Dec. 28, 2007. **Claims 1-22** are now pending in the present application. **This Action is made FINAL.**

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The information disclosure statements submitted on Oct. 25, 2007, Nov. 14, 2007, Jan. 18, 2008 and March, 14, 2008 have been considered by the Examiner and made of record in the application file.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. **Claims 1, 3, and 7-9** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by **Rogalski et al. (U.S. Patent Application Pub. # 2004/0141484 A1)** (hereafter Rogalski).

Consider **claim 1**, Rogalski clearly shows and discloses a system for providing voice and data services over a wired data network and over a regulated wireless network, the system comprising:

a first wireless network (FIG. 5 for system 500) including at least one wireless access point (FIG. 5 for voice data gateway 510) wired to the wired data network (FIG. 5 for broadband network 530), the at least one wireless access point being operative to provide wireless access to the wired data network over an unregulated wireless connection (see FIG. 5 and lines 11-13 par. 0029 as indication of using WLAN standard as the wireless access point 510); and

at least one digital cordless handset for communicating with the at least one wireless access point via the unregulated wireless connection in order to provide the voice and data services (FIG. 5 for cordless handsets 560, 570 and lines 3-4 of par. 0029; also lines 7-9 of par. 0031 should be considered as indication of using unregulated wireless connection of WLAN, “a WLAN system and a cordless telephony system since both of these systems operate in the same band (i.e., the 2.4 GHz band)...”).

Consider **claim 3 as applied to claim 1 above**, Rogalski discloses the at least one digital cordless handset is operative to communicate with the wired data network

via the at least one wireless access point (FIG. 5 for PSTN network 520 and lines 3-7 of par. 0025).

Consider **claim 7 as applied to claim 1 above**, Rogalski discloses the unregulated wireless connection is an IEEE 802.11b connection (lines 11-12 of par. 0029, “the gateway uses the 802.11b standard.”).

Consider **claim 8**, Rogalski clearly discloses a method of providing voice and data services over a wired data network, comprising:

detecting a digital cordless handset in range of a wireless access point over an unregulated wireless connection, wherein the wireless access point is wired to the wired data network (FIG. 1 for digital cordless handsets 560 and 570, wireless access point 510, data network 530 and voice network 520 and par. 0023; also lines 7-9 of par. 0031 should be considered as indication of using unregulated wireless connection of WLAN); and

providing for incoming calls to and outgoing calls from the digital cordless handset and through the wired data network (lines 3-6 of par. 0025).

Consider **claim 9 as applied to claim 8 above**, Rogalski clearly discloses obtaining identification information from the digital cordless handset; and determining the voice and data services to provide to the digital cordless handset over the wired data network based upon the obtained identification information (lines 4-6 of par. 0024,

“VDG 510 automatically determines if a PSTN connection is available and determines if broadband network 530 supports data only or data with voice services” and par. 0025; it is inherently taught an well known that each cordless has a unique identification information otherwise the VDG 510 could not recognize terminals 560 and 570).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the Examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the Examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.

Art Unit: 2617

2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

6. **Claim 2** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Rogalski et al. (U.S. Patent Application Pub. # 2004/0141484 A1)** (hereafter Rogalski) in view of **Jonsson (U.S. Patent # 5915224)**.

Consider **claim 2 as applied to claim 1 above**, Rogalski discloses the wireless network is operated by a first provider (FIG. 5 network 530); however, Rogalski fails to disclose the system further comprises a second wireless network operated by a second provider, and wherein the at least one digital cordless handset is further operative to interoperate between the first wireless network and the second wireless network.

In the same field of endeavor, Jonsson discloses the system further comprises a second wireless network operated by a second provider, and wherein the at least one digital cordless handset is further operative to interoperate between the first wireless network and the second wireless network (see FIG. 3 and network providers 14, 15 and 15 and wireless network 20's and lines 8-9 of col. 7, "a number of business cordless networks 14,15, 16..." and lines 37-45 of col. 7 for interoperation of cordless handset between wireless networks).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to incorporate the other wireless network with different

network provider as taught by Jonsson to the system with wireless network and digital cordless phone disclosed by Rogalski for purpose of using the cordless phones from one WLAN to another WLAN. The proper motivation is to roam handset phones between networks.

7. **Claims 4-6** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Rogalski et al. (U.S. Patent Application Pub. # 2004/0141484 A1)** (hereafter Rogalski) in view of **Baek (U.S. Patent # 6081726)**.

Consider **claim 4 as applied to claim 3 above**, Rogalski disclose the claimed invention except the at least one digital cordless handset is operative to switch between a first wireless access point and a second wireless access point during voice or data communication.

In the same field of endeavor, Baek discloses the at least one digital cordless handset is operative to switch between a first wireless access point and a second wireless access point during voice or data communication (FIG. 1 and lines 47-54 of col. 4, "the first terminal 151 on line with that of the first telephone 131 through the first public base station 141 can keep the communication through the second public base station 142 without any interruption. As a result, a handover service is furnished to have no interruption of communication...").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to incorporate the handover service for cordless phone as

taught by Baek to the network system disclosed by Rogalski for purpose of continuing communication when the user moves from one network to another. The proper motivation is to provide a digital cordless telephone system with incoming call and handover services (Baek lines 35-37 of col. 1).

Consider **claim 5 as applied to claim 4 above**, Baek discloses switching between the first wireless access point and the second wireless access point comprises exiting a wireless transmission area of the first wireless access point and entering a wireless transmission area of the second wireless access point (FIG. 1 and lines 27-54 of col. 4, "When the subscriber of terminal 151 on line is out of the service area of base station 141 and moves into the service area of the base station 142...").

Consider **claim 6 as applied to claim 4 above**, Baek discloses the at least one digital cordless handset contains identification information, and wherein the identification information is transferred from the first wireless network to the wired data network (lines 56-55 of col. 1, "A central control unit stores information concerning the respective cordless telephones..." the stored information of cordless is considered as identification information). In addition, Rogalski discloses where it is determined what voice and data services to provide based on the identification information (lines 4-6 of par. 0024, "VDG 510 automatically determines if a PSTN connection is available and determines if broadband network 530 supports data only or data with voice services"

and par. 0025; it is inherently taught that each cordless has a unique identification information otherwise the VDG 510 could not recognize the terminal 560 and 570).

8. **Claims 10-13 and 22** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Rogalski et al. (U.S. Patent Application Pub. # 2004/0141484 A1)** (hereafter Rogalski) in view of **Moore, JR. (U.S. Patent Application Pub. # 2003/0039242 A1)** (hereafter Moore).

Consider **claim 10 as applied to claim 8 above**, Rogalski disclosed establishing a VoIP session between the digital cordless handset and the wired network through wireless access point (see FIG. 5 and lines 4-8 of par. 0029, "The gateway can configured to allow for flexibility for both conventional PSTN telephony and broadband based telephony. Broadband-based telephony can include, for example, VoIP...")

However, Rogalski fails to explicitly disclose the details of assigning an IP address to the digital cordless handset upon detecting the handset being in range of the wireless access point, and wherein providing for incoming and outgoing calls comprises establishing a VoIP session between the digital cordless handset and the wired data network through wireless access point.

In the same field of endeavor, Moore clearly discloses assigning an IP address to the digital cordless handset upon detecting the handset being in range of the wireless access point (FIG. 5 and lines 1-3 of par. 0040, "handset 10 may dynamically assigned a new IP address on IP subset of the VoIP gateway 20."), and wherein providing for

incoming and outgoing calls comprises establishing a VoIP session between the digital cordless handset and the wired data network through wireless access point (lines 1-3 of par. 0004, "allow a subscriber to have incoming and outgoing calls placed from his handset..."; lines 4-7 of par. 0018, "If the mobile handset is within range of the local wireless network of the VoIP gateway, it acts as a cordless phone and uses the VoIP gateway to make and receive calls").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to combine the method of assigning IP address and make incoming and outgoing call from the cordless phone as taught by Moore to the wireless access point disclosed by Rogalski for purpose of using voice-over-IP technology in a home wireless network. The proper motivation is from Moore (lines 1-3 of par. 0004) "to allow subscriber to have incoming and outgoing calls placed from his handset automatically use the local VoIP access network when the subscriber is at home."

Consider **claim 11 as applied to claim 10 above**, Moore further discloses providing for incoming calls comprises detecting an IP address corresponding to a telephone number that is called and wherein the VoIP session is established with the digital cordless handset that is assigned the IP address corresponding to the telephone number (FIG. 5 and lines 1-3 of par. 0035, "Once within range of the local network 15, the mobile handset 10 and the VoIP gateway 20 enter "cordless phone" mode. In this mode, the mobile handset is associated with one of the telephone numbers associated

with the VoIP gateway 20... Calls can be received or initiated on that line with either the mobile handset 10.”).

Consider **claim 12 as applied to claim 10 above**, Moore further discloses providing for outgoing calls comprises establishing the VoIP session when receiving a dialed number at the digital cordless handset and completing a call to the party corresponding to the dialed number (FIG. 5 and lines 1-3 of par. 0035, “Once within range of the local network 15, the mobile handset 10 and the VoIP gateway 20 enter "cordless phone" mode. In this mode, the mobile handset is associated with one of the telephone numbers associated with the VoIP gateway 20... Calls can be received or initiated on that line with either the mobile handset 10.”)

Consider **claim 13 as applied to claim 8 above**, Moore further discloses the unregulated wireless connection is a bluetooth connection (lines 1-5 of par. 0054, “integrating mobile handsets with an HFC-based VoIP gateway for residential use may utilize BluetoothTM wireless protocol to connect the handset 10 to the VoIP gateway 20”).

Consider **claim 22 as applied to claim 12 above**, Moore further discloses the unregulated wireless connection is an IEEE 802.11b connection (line 3 of par. 0023)

9. **Claims 14-21** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Jones et al. (U.S. Patent # 6404764 B1)** (hereafter Jones) in view of **Rogalski et al. (U.S. Patent Application Pub. # 2004/0141484 A1)** (hereafter Rogalski).

Consider **claim 14**, Jones clearly shows and discloses a system for providing voice and data services over a wired data network, the system comprising:

a broadband residential gateway comprising (FIG. 2 for network premises gateway 10) a first network device for communicating with the wired data network (FIG. 2 for internet access device 14; lines 23-24 of col. 2), a second network device for providing a communications link to at least one wired network device over a local wired network (see FIG. 2 for gateway 10 and FIG. 4 for network backbone as the second network device; and different interfaces such as Ethernet and 1394 interface connected to local backbone as wired network), and a wireless access point operative to provide wireless access to the wired data network over a wireless connection (FIG. 2 for wireless network provided for digital handset 30 from network disclosed in lines 6-9 of col. 3 and lines 3-6 of col. 10; wireless network for analog cordless telephone 28 disclosed in lines 59-57 of col. 2); and

at least one digital cordless handset for communicating with the wireless access point via the wireless connection in order to provide the voice and data services.

However, Jones fails to explicitly the wireless connection is an unregulated wireless connection.

In the same field of endeavor, Rogalski clearly show the wireless connection is unregulated wireless connection (lines 3-14 of par. 0029, “the gateway of the invention utilizes a single air interface for cordless telephony... broadband-based telephony can include, for example, VoIP... Preferably, the gateway uses 802.11b...” 802.11b uses unregulated/unlicensed frequency band 2.4 GHz, lines 7-9 of par. 0031).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to incorporate unlicensed wireless connection as taught by Rogalski to the wireless connection between wireless digital handsets (FIG. 2 for wireless handsets 30) and wireless access point (FIG. 2 gateway 10) for purpose of using WLAN standard. The proper motivation is to communicate through public spectrum bands.

Consider **claim 15 as applied to claim 14 above**, Jones discloses the at least wired network device comprises at least one digital wired handsets for communicating with the wired data network in order to provide the voice and data services (FIG. 2 for digital IP devices 30 and lines 23-25 of col. 5, “the IP telephony H.323 engine 36 may be used to support wired or wireless IP devices 30 which support VoIP functionality”).

Consider **claim 16 as applied to claim 15 above**, Jones discloses the local wired network comprises a home phone networking alliance network (FIG. 1 and lines 14-5 of col. 2, “The whole-home IP telephone system with VoIP functionality and associated internet connectivity is embedded in the network premises gateway 10...”; or

FIG. 2 for digital IP devices 30 and lines 23-25 of col. 5, "the IP telephony H.323 engine 36 may be used to support wired or wireless IP devices 30 which support VoIP functionality").

Consider **claim 17 as applied to claim 15 above**, Jones discloses the wired data network is operative to generate a telephone call directed toward the broadband residential gateway and wherein the telephone call may be answered on the at least one digital cordless handset or the at least one digital wired handset (FIG. 2 and lines 23-27 of col. 4, "The telephony crossbar 42 is the "spine" of the telephony subsystem 34; the telephony crossbar 42 couples the telephony manager 38 and the POTS interface 40 to each other. The telephony crossbar 42 is also a router for all telephony calls, PSTN and VoIP, alike.")

Consider **claim 18 as applied to claim 15 above**, Jones discloses the broadband residential gateway is operative to generate a telephone call directed toward the wired data network and wherein the telephone call may be initiated on the at least one digital cordless handset or the at least one digital wired handset (lines 14-26 of col. 10, "when placing an outgoing call from the digital wireless handsets 30... The digital signals are translated to a format compatible for a network used in completing the outgoing call at the network premises gateway 10, wherein the network is... an internet 12 for VoIP-based calls.").

Consider **claim 19 as applied to claim 15 above**, Jones discloses the system further comprises a directory information database and wherein at least one the digital cordless handset or the at least one digital wired handsets is operative to access directory information provided by the directory information database (lines 12-18 of col. 9, “the network premises gateway 10 performs... and references the name and IP address against a database contained in the system controller and memory component 32 of the network premises gateway 10 in order to do a name look-up.”)

Consider **claim 20 as applied to claim 14 above**, Rogalski discloses the at least one digital cordless handset transmits a user identifier to the wired data network and wherein the system further comprises a restriction database of the wired network that applies rules to telephone calls of the at least one digital cordless handsets based on a user of the at least one digital cordless handset (FIG. 8 and lines 1-3 of par. 0069 and par. 0070 for restriction definition in database of firewall; user identifier is inherently taught since every device has to have a type of recognized ID to access to a network).

Consider **claim 21 as applied to claim 14 above**, Rogalski discloses the system further comprises a web interface at a personal computer linked to the wired data network, wherein the web interface provides for entry of administrative information for providing the voice and data services over the wired data network (FIG. 6 and par. 0061, “With the interconnection between the gateway and the PC (i.e., wired data terminal 540), the processing power of the PC can be leveraged to enhance the

functions of the cordless telephony system in a way that would otherwise be impractical or cost prohibitive.”).

Response to Amendment

10. The affidavit filed on Dec. 28, 2007 under 37 CFR 1.131 has been considered but is ineffective to overcome the Rogalski reference.

11. The declaration must be signed by all inventors since it is not shown that less than all named inventors of the application invented the subject matter of the claims under rejection.

12. The evidence submitted is insufficient to establish a reduction to practice of the invention in this country or a NAFTA or WTO member country prior to the effective date of the Rogalski reference.

13. The evidence submitted is insufficient to establish diligence from a date prior to the date of reduction to practice of the Rogalski reference to either a constructive reduction to practice or an actual reduction to practice.

For example, there is no evidence to show diligence between 11/19/2002 to 06/06/2003 and/or 06/23/2003.

Response to Arguments

14. Applicant's arguments filed Dec. 28, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Since all Applicants failed to sign the declaration, and failed to shown reduction to practice prior to the Rogalski reference or show diligence from 11/19/2002 to 06/06/2003 **claims 1-21** are rejected by the Rogalski references alone or in view of Jonsson, Baek, Moore or Jones.

Conclusion

15. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

16. Any response to this Office Action should be **faxed to (571) 273-8300 or mailed to:**

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to

Customer Service Window
Randolph Building
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

17. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Allahyar Kasraian whose telephone number is (571) 270-1772. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Rafael Pérez-Gutiérrez can be reached on (571) 272-7915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free) or 571-272-4100.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist/customer service whose telephone number is (571) 272-2600.

/Allahyar Kasraian/

Application/Control Number: 10/614,737
Art Unit: 2617

Page 19

Examiner, Art Unit 2617

March 26, 2008

/Rafael Pérez-Gutiérrez/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617